

22. A traction device as claimed in claim 21, wherein said headpiece is adapted to have a portion residing on the lowest part of the back of the skull, intermediate the head and the neck, thus, when the user extends their legs, said portion residing on the lowest part of the back of the skull helps stretch the muscles at the back of the neck and allow separation of the bones in the neck, causing a therapeutic effect on the user.

REMARKS

1) Examiner has objected to the Abstract of the Disclosure due to minor informalities. A substitute Abstract of the Disclosure is provided on page 2 of this Amendment. It is believed that the new Abstract of the Disclosure complies with MPEP 608.01 (b). As such, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner substitute the new Abstract of the Disclosure and withdraw the rejection thereto.

1.1) During preparation of this Amendment, several errors were located in the Drawing Figures. These errors had to do with the numbering of certain elements. Applicant is enclosing the Figures in question with the corrections made in red for Examiner approval. Formal Drawings will be provided when patentable subject matter has been indicated by the Examiner.

1.2) Additionally during preparation of this Amendment, several errors were located in the Specification. Substitute paragraphs are provided in this Amendment correcting the numbering errors so that the numerical designations on the Drawing figures correspond with those in the Specification. Applicant respectfully requests that these paragraphs be substituted. No new matter is being added.

2) Examiner rejected Claims 1-5 and 10 under the provisions of 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Goodley. By action of this Amendment, the claims in question have been canceled. Therefor the rejection is deemed moot. The new independent claims 13 and 20 have been drafted to more specifically claim the instant invention. It is believed that specific structure is positively recited in the new claims which would not be anticipated by Goodley or

any art of record. Examiner enumerates in paragraphs 2-7 of the First Office Action how Goodley would be applied to the above mentioned claims. Again, in response to these specific claim rejections, the cancellation of the claims in question makes the rejection moot.

3) In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, Claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodley '274 in view of Tsujino '565. Once again, since these claims were canceled by action of this Amendment, this rejection is deemed moot. Even if the teachings of the '274 and the '565 patent were combined, they would not teach, show, or anticipate the claimed invention. The new claims more specifically claim the structure of the Applicant's invention. The structure of the Applicant's headpiece, shown in Figures 5 & 6 of the Application and specifically claimed in the new independent claims is not shown in these or any other patent of record.

4) In paragraph 21 of the Office Action, claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodley in view of D'Amico et al. (6,113,563). Again, due to the action of the Amendment, the claims that the rejection is being made against have been canceled and is deemed moot. The new claims more specifically claim the instant invention, including specific structure proximal the pulley for securing the instant invention to the door.

5) Returning to the new independent claim 13, we have specifically drafted the claim to more specifically claim the structure of the instant invention. The dual unit headpiece is not shown in Figure 11 of Goodley. Nor does it show a right or left slot for receiving the securing band. If the Examiner would compare Figure 5 of the instant invention to Figure 11 of Goodley, one should note that the strap location in the instant invention is lower, as opposed to being approximately in the center as shown in Goodley.

These differences, coupled with other specifically claimed elements in the new claims are not taught by the art of record. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider the new claims without prejudice, as it is easier to draft new claims than to amend old claims under the new rules.

Applicant has added new claims which are believed to be allowable over any art of record. As such, the Examiner is asked to allow this case and send it to Issue Branch as soon as possible. If the Applicant's Agent can be of any assistance, please contact him weekdays 9-5 at his office, 703-998-5708.

Respectively,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Hamill". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first and last names being clearly legible.

Tom Hamill

Reg. No. 38,481

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☒ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☒ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☒ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.